

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/082,712	ARORA, PRAMOD K.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Timothy H. Meeks	1762	

All Participants:

(1) Timothy H. Meeks.

(2) Gregory Turocy.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 October 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Dombrowski in view of kamura et al.

Claims discussed:

1-11 and 26-30

Prior art documents discussed:

above

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner's position is that non-POSS claims remain unpatentable over Dombrowski in view of Kamura et al. given disclosure that metal having claimed porosity has advantages for vaporization of impregnated amphiphilic compounds. However, POSS claims are patentable for the reasons stated in the attached reasons for allowance. Applicants agreed to advance prosecution of the case by canceling claims 1-11 and 26-30 without prejudice, leaving only allowable claims 21-25, 31, and 32 to place the application in condition for allowance .